

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-11, 13 and 16-23 are pending and stand rejected.

By this Amendment claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 16 and 23 are amended and claims 7, 11, 13 and 18 are canceled without prejudice.

No new matter is added by the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the original specification and, for example, in the original specification at page 10 last full paragraph and Fig. 2.

Rejection of Claims 1-11, 13 and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, at item 3, claims 1-11, 13 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1, 8-9 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 4, claims 1, 8-9 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kato (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0051971) in view of Mageee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,710, hereafter referred to as Mageee).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method of task management using memory ranges of shared memory, and recites:

...
combining one or more atomic results of execution of each atomic sub-task corresponding to a task into a result of the task by providing the one or more atomic results from each of the plurality of processors, individually coupled to a single summing junction to the single summing junction.
...

In the Office Action, at page 7, the Examiner acknowledges that Kato and Magee "do not explicitly teach: Providing a summing junction as part of the kernel; Combining the execution results of each of the atomic sub-tasks for a completed task using the summing junction..." Applicants respectfully submit that Kato and Magee are silent regarding a single summing junction and, more particularly, "combining one or more atomic result of execution of each atomic sub-tasks corresponding to a task into a result of the task by providing the one or more atomic results from each of the plurality of processors, individually coupled to a single summing junction, to the single summing junction," as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claim 8

Claim 8, which includes similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee for at least similar reasons to those set forth regarding claim 1.

Claims 9 and 21-22

Claims 9 and 21-22, which include all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 8, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee for at least similar reasons to those set forth regarding claim 1 or claim 8.

Rejection of Claims 13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 11, claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Magee in further view of Martin (U.S. Patent No. 4,466,064).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 13

Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 is now moot.

Claim 23

Claim 23, which includes all the limitations of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee for at least the same reasons as set forth above regarding claim 1.

The addition of Martin does not overcome the deficiencies of Kato in view of Magee. This is because Martin does not disclose or suggest "combining one or more atomic results of execution of each atomic sub-tasks corresponding to a task into a result of the task by providing the one or more atomic results from each of the plurality of processors, individually coupled to a single summing junction, to the single summing junction," as required by claim 1. Instead, Martin discloses a network of modules, for example, modules 00-03, 10-13, and 20-23 of Fig. 1. Each module of Martin is interconnected with four other modules. When an elementary partial task is activated, it is executed in the relevant result signal is returned to the module where the partial task was formed in order to be combined with the result of any further partial task. Finally, the result of the task of the original algorithm appears in the module "00" in order to be applied to the environment. (See Martin at column 5, lines 52-58.) That is, Martin teaches away from a single summing junction individually coupled to each of the plurality of processors. This is because, in Martin only four processors are coupled to module "00" and individual partial tasks are combined in intermediate modules.

Accordingly, claim 23 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato and Magee in further view of Martin for at least the same reasons as set forth above regarding claim 1.

Claim 23 also includes patentable distinctions beyond those of claim 1, namely that "routing the combined execution results of the completed task to an input/out port for delivery to a calling process." Neither Kato, Magee nor Martin disclose or suggest such a feature.

Rejection of Claims 2-6, 10-11 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 14, claims 2-6, 10-11 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Magee in further view of Koning (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0133530).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 18

Claims 11 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Claim 16

Claim 16, which includes similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee for at least similar reasons to those regarding claim 1.

The addition of Koning does not overcome the deficiencies of Kato in view of Magee. This is because Koning is silent regarding "a single summing junction" and, more particularly, "combining one or more atomic results of execution of each atomic sub-task corresponding to a task into a result of the task by providing the one or more atomic results from each of the plurality of processors, individually coupled to a single summing junction, to the single summing junction," as required by claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 16 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee in further view of Koning for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claims 2-6, 10, 17 and 19-20

Claims 2-6, 10, 17 and 19-20, which include all of the limitations of claim 1, 8 or 16, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Kato in view of Magee in further view of Koning for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 27, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Magee and Koning and in further view of Martin.

Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

Appln. No.: 10/729,463
Amendment Dated August 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2008

IBMV-507US

Conclusion

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Eric Berkowitz, Reg. No. 40,030
Attorneys for Applicants

LEA/EB/ams

Dated: August 1, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA on August 1, 2008:

April Smith

A_H:\WRPORTBL\RPV\SMITH\316616_1.DOC